



COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF UZBEK AND TURKISH GRAMMATICAL STRUCTURES AS A BASIS FOR EFFECTIVE TURKISH LANGUAGE TEACHING METHODOLOGY

Shorasulova Arofat Ibroxim qizi

Turkish Language Teacher at the University of Oriental Studies

Abstract

This article examines the comparative grammatical structures of Uzbek and Turkish languages as a theoretical foundation for developing effective Turkish language teaching methodologies for Uzbek-speaking learners. The research demonstrates that pedagogical approaches which use structural parallels to teach different features of language will improve learning efficiency. The findings create contrastive linguistic frameworks which educators can use to teach Turkish in Uzbekistan's educational system.

Keywords: Comparative linguistics, grammatical structures, language teaching methodology, agglutination, vowel harmony, contrastive analysis.

Introduction

The genetic relationship between Uzbek and Turkish languages, both belonging to the Turkic language family, presents unique opportunities and challenges for language pedagogy. The two languages display basic structural similarities because they both descend from their shared Proto-Turkic root, but their independent evolution through different linguistic interactions has resulted in major differences which need to be tackled during teaching situations [1]. The application of contrastive linguistic analysis to language teaching has been recognized as a fundamental methodological approach since the mid-twentieth century, when researchers began systematically investigating how knowledge of a learner's native language could facilitate or impede second language acquisition [2]. The Turkish language instruction of Uzbek speakers establishes a unique teaching environment because their two languages show typological similarities which create different transfer effects compared to teaching methods that apply to languages which have no connection to each other.



The research investigates Uzbek and Turkish languages through grammatical structure comparison to discover their similarities and differences which create instructional methods for teaching purposes. The research study provides practical value because it can guide the development of Turkish language programs in Uzbekistan through its findings about curriculum design and material creation and teaching methods which track the rising need for Turkish language skills that comes with growing economic and cultural ties with Turkey [3]. The theoretical framework uses clash analysis hypothesis principles to show that language structure comparison allows teachers to determine student learning challenges while teaching methods need to follow current transfer theory which shows how languages interact for second language learning [4].

METHODOLOGY AND LITERATURE REVIEW

The researchers used qualitative research methods to study existing linguistic literature and grammatical descriptions and comparative studies of Uzbek and Turkish languages. The research method uses descriptive linguistic analysis together with pedagogical interpretation to study academic publications from Uzbek, Russian, Turkish, and worldwide academic sources that appeared during the last thirty years. The selection of sources prioritizes authoritative grammatical descriptions, comparative linguistic studies, and research specifically addressing pedagogical applications of structural analysis [5]. The analytical framework performs a systematic examination of all primary grammatical areas which include phonological systems and morphological structures and syntactic patterns and semantic-functional categories while assessing each area according to its structural similarities and potential uses in teaching.

The research literature demonstrates a deep scholarly interest in exploring the historical progression and categorization methods used for Turkic languages, which established fundamental works that proved the genetic connections and common characteristics shared by Turkic languages [6]. The comparative studies show that both Uzbek and Turkish languages use agglutination as their main morphological feature because they build words through adding multiple suffixes to fixed stem base forms to create complete grammatical units. The research analysis shows how different languages use specific rules for arranging their morphological markers and maintaining vowel harmony together with their phonological rules that determine



how suffixes should be pronounced [7]. The research about Turkish phonology shows a vowel harmony system which uses eight vowels to create a system that operates between morpheme boundaries while Uzbek displays a vowel harmony pattern that has become more limited because of Persian and Russian language contact in specific phonological environments [1]. The syntactic research shows that both languages maintain a subject-object-verb word order pattern while they share postpositional phrase structures and participial relative clause formation together with extensive use of converb forms to create subordinate clauses [8].

The available pedagogical literature about Turkish language teaching for native speakers of related Turkic languages shows limited research compared to overall Turkish language teaching studies, although recent years have seen increased academic research on contrastive methods according to study [9]. The existing research shows that Uzbek speakers need explicit language instruction to overcome Turkish language transfer errors because their first language shares structural elements with Turkish and they can learn basic sentence structure and morphological patterns. Research shows that learners tend to overapply Uzbek language rules to the points where the two languages show differences between them, which includes the usage of vowel harmony and case in specific syntactic contexts and the methods of expressing temporal and evidential meanings according to study [10]. The literature emphasizes the importance of consciousness-raising activities that explicitly highlight structural differences while building upon shared features, suggesting that effective methodology must move beyond simple structural comparison to address functional and pragmatic dimensions of language use.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The comparative analysis between Uzbek and Turkish grammatical systems shows multiple critical educational results. First, the investigation confirms that both languages exhibit highly productive agglutinative morphology with consistent right-branching suffixation patterns which create a fundamental structural similarity that facilitates morphological awareness transfer from Uzbek to Turkish. Uzbek speakers understand agglutination principles which include suffix ordering rules and auxiliary verb construction for complex predicate formation, so they transfer those rules directly to Turkish morphological processing. The structural similarity between Turkish and Uzbek languages enables Turkish language instruction for Uzbek



speakers to progress faster through morphological content because learners already possess the mental frameworks needed to understand and produce agglutinative language structures. The analysis shows vowel harmony systems between the two languages differ fundamentally because Turkish uses a more extensive and consistent harmony system compared to the modern Uzbek language. Contemporary Uzbek exhibits more vowel harmony irregularity than both languages because historical sound changes and word borrowing from other languages have affected its vowel harmony system. Turkish harmony rules require consistent application from Uzbek speakers because both languages share similar structural elements despite their actual linguistic differences. The pedagogical aspect of this finding shows teachers need to teach Turkish vowel harmony as a phonological system which students must learn through active study instead of relying on their existing Uzbek language knowledge. The investigation shows three major similarities in syntactic structure which include the use of SOV word order together with postpositions as a replacement for prepositions and the creation of subordinate clauses through both participial and converb methods. Uzbek speakers produce grammatically correct Turkish sentences at basic structural levels because shared syntactic features between their native language and Turkish create positive transfer conditions which require them to learn only basic Turkish syntax. The analysis shows both languages use identical methods for relativization and complementation and adverbial clause creation which enables teachers to shift their instructional time from teaching basic Turkish syntactic patterns to teaching advanced Turkish grammar elements. The study shows that Turkish and Uzbek language systems include different methods for expressing definiteness and specificity which Turkish natives express through the accusative case marker and Uzbek speakers use word order and optional determiners. The difference creates a situation where Uzbek speakers make systematic errors because they try to use their native language definiteness rules in Turkish situations which requires special teaching that explains how Turkish case marking works in various situations.

Third, the comparative analysis highlights differences in the grammatical expression of evidentiality and temporal-aspectual categories, domains where the languages have developed distinct systemic organizations. While both languages possess rich tense-aspect-mood systems expressed through verbal morphology, Turkish has developed more elaborate evidential distinctions, particularly the systematic contrast between direct and indirect evidentiality encoded in past tense paradigms. Uzbek evidential



marking operates differently, creating potential confusion when learners encounter Turkish evidential forms. The pedagogical implication suggests that explicit instruction addressing evidentiality as a semantic-grammatical category, rather than simply as variant past tense forms, may enhance learner comprehension and productive control of these structures. Additionally, the investigation reveals differences in aspect marking and the expression of progressive and habitual meanings, where the languages employ partially overlapping but not identical morphological and periphrastic strategies.

CONCLUSION

This comparative analysis of Uzbek and Turkish grammatical structures establishes a theoretical foundation for developing effective Turkish language teaching methodologies tailored to Uzbek-speaking learners. The investigation demonstrates that while genetic relationship creates substantial structural similarities facilitating positive transfer in morphological organization and basic syntactic patterns, significant divergences in vowel harmony systems, case function, and evidential categories require explicit pedagogical attention. Effective methodology should leverage shared agglutinative morphology and syntactic organization to accelerate learning while implementing consciousness-raising activities addressing areas of structural divergence. The findings support a pedagogical approach combining implicit structural transfer with explicit focus on divergent features, moving beyond simple contrastive analysis to address functional and pragmatic dimensions of grammatical structures.

REFERENCES

1. Johanson, L. (2001). Discoveries on the Turkic linguistic map. Stockholm: Swedish Research Institute.
2. Lado, R. (1957). Linguistics across cultures: Applied linguistics for language teachers. University of Michigan Press.
3. Shadiev, R., & Huang, Y. M. (2020). A review of research on mobile-assisted language learning in Uzbekistan. *Interactive Learning Environments*, 28(6), 778-795.
4. Jarvis, S., & Pavlenko, A. (2008). Crosslinguistic influence in language and cognition. Routledge.



5. Göksel, A., & Kerslake, C. (2005). Turkish: A comprehensive grammar. Routledge.
6. Schönig, C. (2003). Turko-Mongolic relations. In Janhunen, J. (Ed.), The Mongolic languages (pp. 403-419). Routledge.
7. Boeschoten, H. (1998). The speakers of Turkic languages. In Johanson, L., & Csató, É. (Eds.), The Turkic languages (pp. 1-15). Routledge.
8. Kornfilt, J. (1997). Turkish. Routledge.
9. Karatay, H. (2016). The role of contrastive analysis in teaching Turkish to speakers of related languages. *Turkish Studies*, 11(9), 451-466.
10. Ismatullayeva, N. (2019). O'zbek va turk tillarining qiyosiy grammatikasi. Toshkent: Akademnashr.